

SAAL-PA

MEMORANDUM FOR PRINCIPAL ASSISTANTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING

SUBJECT: 4Q2000 Quarterly Bid Protest Analysis Reports

The quarterly reports for GAO and interagency level protests for the period July 1 through September 30, 2000 (4Q00) is provided in accordance with AFARS 33.190. Additional information related to a GAO protest decision noted on the lessons learned portion of this report can be obtained on GAO's web site http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces170.shtml. GAO does not provide a decision on GAO protests that are dismissed or are academic. The interagency's level protest reports are not posted on a web site.

LTC Jacob B. Hansen
Director, Information
Management and Assessment

**QUARTERLY REPORT FOR GAO PROTESTS
FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2000 (4Q00)**

1. Number of protests filed:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	62	48	80
o AMC	20	15	25
o USACE	23	14	21
o DA Other	19	19	34

Please refer to listing of protests by MACOM at end of this report.

2. Number of protests sustained/granted:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	4	3	4
o AMC	1	0	1
o USACE	0	1	1
o DA Other	3	2	2

3. Costs:

a. Costs and fees awarded by GAO to protester:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$26,016	\$0	\$0
o AMC	\$0	\$0	\$0
o USACE	\$0	\$0	\$0
o DA Other	\$26,016	\$0	\$0

b. Estimated preaward value of requirement or postaward contract cost/price:

(1) Preaward protests (estimated value of requirement):

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$193,349,000	\$111,558,724	\$192,191,523
o AMC	\$168,328,618	\$29,110,230	\$181,673,128
o USACE	\$24,078,000	\$3,099,243	\$10,440,242
o DA Other	\$942,382	\$79,349,251	\$78,153

(2) Postaward protests (contract cost/price):

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$305,982,499	\$313,346,107	\$380,341,199
o AMC	\$165,263,409	\$246,134,275	\$360,930,733
o USACE	\$56,018,983	\$26,179,765	\$19,301,644
o DA Other	\$84,700,107	\$41,032,067	\$108,822

c. Total government personnel costs resulting from protests:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$221,123	\$157,269	\$179,813
o AMC	\$176,942	\$117,519	\$144,846
o USACE	\$37,478	\$21,253	\$31,147
o DA Other	\$6,703	\$18,497	\$3,820

4. Lessons learned, issues and trends:

AMC Lessons Learned:

a. McGregor Manufacturing Corporation, B-285341.1, Denied

Lessons Learn:

1. Newly approved sources, especially for first-time breakout items, should be required to actually produce an acceptable item before being awarded a large quantity production contract. In the instant case, McGregor was apparently approved as a source for the deswirl ducts to McGregor, that our Technical Data Package (TDP) was too deficient to permit McGregor to actually produce acceptable items. Had McGregor been required to produce an acceptable deswirl duct as part of the source approval process, many of the problems that surfaced with the TDP after contract award would have been discovered and likely resolved before McGregor was awarded the contract.

2. Where a new source has been properly approved (after having actually produced an acceptable item), but the item for which it is approved is a first-time breakout item, the newly approved source should first be awarded a normal lot-size quantity as the contract quantity. After completion, its performance on this limited quantity contract should be evaluated in all respects to determine the prudence of awarding a follow-on contract in any quantity to the newly approved source.
3. In the scenario described in Lesson #2, if the limited quantity contract is not sufficient to meet the agency's requirements for the first-time breakout item, the agency should consider dual-sourcing the requirement, i.e., awarding a larger quantity contract to a "proven producer" of the item in conjunction with awarding the limited quantity contract to the newly approved source. Contract provisions should be appropriately modified to prevent the newly approved source from obtaining incumbent status during the performance of this limited quantity contract such that it prevents the agency from meeting its requirements by whatever legal means the agency deems most appropriate.
4. In the course of performance under a contract for critical supply items, the contracting officer should consider a partial termination for the convenience of the Government when: (1) it becomes clear that the contractor will not be able to meet the agency's required delivery schedule, (2) a fair assessment of all the relevant facts indicates that the contractor will likely continue to experience delays in performance (for whatever reason) even after any extension of the delivery schedule, (3) the agency is able to timely reprocur the terminated portion of the contract from a reliable source, and (4) the agency will suffer irreparable harm if it does not timely reprocur the terminated portion of the contract.

b. Orion Scientific Systems, B-285424, Withdrawn.

This was a mini-competition among GSA Federal Supply Schedule contractors. The contractors were competing for a blanket purchase agreement under which task orders for information technology support services would be issued on a labor-hour basis. Orion, assuming that support services would be issued on a labor-hour basis. Orion, assuming that support services related to its proprietary software tool (LEADS) were covered by the statement of work (SOW), included labor hours for such services in its proposal. On a number of occasions, the Government told Orion that support for LEADS was not part of the SOW. In the written request for best and final offers (BAFOs), the contracting officer specifically told Orion to delete from its proposal all LEADS support hours. In making those deletions, however, Orion also deleted hours not related to LEADS support, creating the risk that its proposal was severely understaffed.

Statements should have been included in the request for proposals (RFP), in both the SOW and instructions to Bidders, that LEADS support was a requirement of the current acquisition, and the labor hours for support of LEADS should be omitted from proposals.

c. Hill Aerospace and Defense, LLC, b-285357, Withdrawn.

In solicitation allowing surplus parts, highlight in bold print at start of RFP to see the section L provision if surplus parts are proposed. Section L instructions on surplus parts need to be re-worked. SOP needed on how to handle surplus parts which would include Acquisition, Legal, IMMC, Engineering, and Quality.

d. Parmatic Filter Corporation, B-285288 and B-285288.2, Denied/Sustained.

Parmatic Filter Corporation (Parmatic) protested TACOM-RI's award for a contract to Hunter Manufacturing Company (Hunter) under Request for Proposal DAAE20-00-R-0015 for M48A1 Gas Particulate Filters, 200 CFM Filter sets, and Hermetically Sealed Filter Canisters (HSFC). Only two offers were submitted. The Source Selection Decision was based on a tradeoff of five factors, including Technical, Quality, Past Performance, Price, and Small Business Participation. The SSA concluded that Hunter's superior non-price rating merited the payment of a 12% premium in price. Parmatic challenged

the ratings of Parmatic and Hunter under essentially every factor. The SSA concluded that TACOM-RI unreasonable evaluated the Quality factor relative to CLIN 0001. The protest was denied in its entirety relative to CLINs 0002 and 0003.

The quality factor contained two subfactors: Quality System and Process Control System. Under the Quality System subfactors section M stated that an offeror merited a Good when the contractor was certified to ISO 9002 or meets those standards. The SSA correctly concluded that Hunter, the offeror, was certified to ISO 9002. However, Hunter indicated in its proposal that CLIN 0001 would be performed by its subsidiary, Hunter Protective Systems (HPS). The SSA determined that HPS' quality system should also be reviewed relative to CLIN 0001 since it was essentially performing that item. The GAO stated that this was reasonable and appropriate even though the evaluation criteria only stated that "the contractor's" quality system would be evaluated. The GAO concluded, however, that the SSA unreasonably concluded that HPS met the ISO 9002 standards, particularly since Hunter itself stated that HPS was only 76% compliant.

Lessons Learn:

1. The quality assurance evaluator did not appropriately assess HPS and the information provided by Hunter and DID NOT SUPPORT HIS CONCLUSION WITH ANALYSIS. His failure to support his conclusion that HPS quality system was equivalent to an ISO 9002 necessitated a hearing at the GAO and resulted in substantial cost to the government.
2. The evaluation criteria could have been better written to provide the SSA with the flexibility to review subcontractors under quality without having to "make a reasonable and appropriate decision" to deviate from the evaluation criteria.

e. Combined Systems, Inc., B-286102, Withdrawn.

Lesson Learn: Where an offeror has failed to submit a proposal by closing date but an amendment correcting the error and extending the time for submission of proposals should have been forwarded to the offeror. The offeror's e-mail identified the error and stated an intention to compete in the procurement if the error could be corrected. The e-mail constituted an agency protest. The e-mail was dated one day before the due date for receipt of proposals. The contracting officer did not receive this e-mail for five calendar days due to illness and not until after proposals were received from the other offerors. Under these circumstances, it would have been prudent to provide the prospective offeror with an amendment correcting the error and extending the time for submission of proposals.

f. DUCOM, Inc, B-285485, Denied.

Where proposals are submitted electronically, it is important to keep all submissions organized and easily accessible. Therefore, if the GAO needs the documents for Administrative Report in hardcopy it is easier and less time consuming. If all relevant documents are together and easy to locate. Organization is a key element.

g. ATA Defense Industries, B-285720, Dismissed.

Rule governing the ordering of non-FSS items in connection with a FSS buy-non-FSS items cannot be purchased from an FSS vendor unless applicable acquisition regulation have been followed. For example, there is proper sole source authority, or the "de minimis" rule governing the ordering of non-FSS items in connection with an FSS buy applies. "De minimis" purchases are at the micro-purchase level. (FAR 2.101--"Micro-purchase" threshold means equal to or less than \$2,500.)

USACE Lessons Learned:

a. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co., B-285209, B-285209.2, Denied.

Protest of solicitation for privatization of 13 utility systems (including electric, natural gas, water and wastewater) at five military installations under MDW's command. Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCO) and Baltimore Gas & Electric Company (BG&E) alleged the solicitation was improper because it failed to acknowledge that state laws and regulations applied to the privatization of the various utility systems, GAO reasoned that the agency was reasonable in its determination that 10 U.S.C 2688, which authorizes the Department of Defense to competitively privatize its utility systems, preempted state law. GAO further held that the agency's decision to consolidate the different utility systems at installation was justified on several grounds, among them significant cost and administrative savings and the fact that the USACE reasonably determined it would not receive offers for less desirable utilities unless combined with other systems.

Lesson Learn: Protests arising out of utility privatization procurements are generally high profile cases where there is little, if any, precedent or regulatory guidance. In addition, protesters are apt to argue the applicability of state law to the AMR's privatization initiatives.

b. Structural Preservation Systems, Inc., B-285085, Denied.

Structural Preservation filed a GAO bid protest against award of a contract under a request for proposals for seepage remediation at an Indiana lake, alleging USACE's tradeoff evaluation was improper and because the record showed USACE's evaluation was reasonable and Structural Preservation, as the low bidder, should have received award. GAO denied the protest because the record showed USACE's evaluation was reasonable and in accordance with evaluation criteria. GAO concluded award was properly made to the offeror submitting the technically higher rated, higher priced proposal because the solicitation contemplated that price and technical factors were of equal weight and the agency reasonably found the proposal's price premium was justified by its technical superiority. There is no requirement for agencies to justify selection of a higher priced proposal through an exact quantification of the dollar value of the proposal's technical superiority.

Lesson Learn: Complex best value tradeoff evaluations must be supported by documentation to include consensus scores and comments recorded by the evaluation board. Notably, even though individual evaluation sheets were discarded, the evaluation team's consensus scores were considered sufficient because they documented comparisons made among proposals, to include strengths, weakness, and risks.

c. Reece Contracting, Inc., B-285666, Denied.

Reece filed a GAO bid protest against award of a contract under an invitation for bids for a levee construction project, alleging the awardee's bid should of have been rejected because it contained unbalanced pricing with the likelihood of advance payment. Reece argued the awardee's price for one contract line item was significantly underpriced, indication that the reasonable price of the work must have been shifted to a line item to be performed earlier. GAO held that revised FAR Part 15 requires agencies to perform a risk analysis to determine whether award to an apparently unbalanced offer would result in paying unreasonably high prices or present an unreasonable risk to the government. Under the circumstances of the case, GAO found reasonable USACE's determination that notwithstanding the possibility of some unbalancing, the awardee's offer did not present an unacceptable risk that the awardee's actual price to become higher than the protester's.

Lesson Learn: This case represents the latest effort by GAO to clarify the FAR Part 15 revision striking the term "advance payment." Thus contracting personnel must be aware that in order to fulfill FAR requirements they will have to conduct a proper risk analysis when an unbalancing is identified.

DA Others - Lessons Learned:

a. Johnson Controls World Services, B-285144, Denied.

The Army issued a Fixed Price RFQ to provide base operations services at Ft. Hamilton. The RFQ was to serve as a bridge contract to provide the required services during the source selection to acquire the services over a multi-year period. The RFQ called for a base period of 4 months plus eight 1-month option periods. No technical proposals were requested since the contracting officer determined the services were commercial items. The protest alleged that (1) the services were not commercial items; (2) the decision to acquire the services based upon price alone prejudiced protester in this competition; (3) the procurement was tainted by a conflict of interest involving a senior quality assurance official who helped prepare the RFQ; (4) announcing the bids would prejudice protester in the larger concurrent source selection; and (5) the agency had no basis to determine all the bidders were technically qualified. The protest was denied, since the protester could not sustain any of their allegations. Because of the lack of prejudice, the GAO did not address whether the Army's decision to purchase the services as commercial items was correct or not.

Lesson Learn: The burden is on the protester to demonstrate prejudice. If it cannot show prejudice the protest will fail - even in the face of apparent procurement irregularity on the part of the Government.

b. Singpoong Korea Company, Limited, B-285786; B-285786.2, Dismissed.

After the protester failed to submit its technical proposal on time, it was eliminated from consideration for award. This protest followed. During the course of the protest, irregularities in the solicitation process were detected, and the solicitation was canceled, provoking yet another protest. GAO dismissed the protest because the protester had not timely submitted its proposal, was not in line for award, and could not be an interested party.

Lesson Learn: A protester that fails to timely submit its proposal is not an interested party. A motion for summary dismissal is the best response to such protests. In any event, ambiguities in a solicitation must be timely and completely corrected with amendments that extend the time for submission of proposals.

c. Lanier Worldwide, B-285422, Dismissed.

Lanier protested an award for dictation and transcription technology to Dictaphone Corp., arguing that the Army failed to properly evaluate the proposals, and failed during discussions to advise Lanier of weaknesses or deficiencies in its proposal. The Army responded that even assuming the protest allegations were true, Lanier was not prejudiced because Dictaphone would still have been technically superior with lower costs. Lanier failed to respond to the Army's prejudice argument which resulted in a dismissal.

Lesson Learn: Since the existence of prejudice is a necessary element of any protest, protest allegations which do not establish the existence of competitive prejudice will fail before GAO.

d. TRS Research, B-285514, Denied.

MTMC issued a solicitation to purchase ammunition shipping containers. MTMC concluded that because all the offers it received were for foreign made containers, the Buy American Act (BAA) premium was inapplicable and awarded to the lowest priced bidder. TRS protested, arguing that it, unlike the other bidders, offered domestic containers. The TRS containers, although manufactured in China, had been refurbished in the U.S. Since this work contributed more than 50% of the price of the containers, TRS argued they should qualify as domestic products under the BAA. GAO disagreed, holding that cosmetic

refurbishment that does not change the "essential nature" of the product furnished does not constitute manufacturing within the meaning of the BAA.

Lesson Learn: The definition of "manufacture" under the BAA has been clarified. It does not include cosmetic changes that improve a product without changing its underlying nature.

e. Green Valley Transportation, Inc., B-285283, Sustained.

On August 9, 2000, GAO sustained GVTD's protest of awards MTMC made on traffic lanes from the Defense Distribution Depot in San Joaquin, CA, to various pints throughout the United States. GAO found that MTMC's evaluation of GVTD's past on-time performance and past on-time delivery percentage was unreasonable. Specifically, GAO found that MTMC failed to take into account the number of total shipments carriers made when assessing past performance, and that MTMC failed to adequately document the past performance evaluations. GAO also found that MTMC acted unreasonably when it failed to consider the wide variance in carriers' shipping volume in assessing past on-time delivery. GVTD limited its protest to six traffic lanes, but the GAO implied that the defects in the evaluation process extended to all 56 lanes.

Lesson Learn: Evaluation criteria that purport to evaluate all past performance information must consider the extent of that past performance experience. An evaluation scheme that equates an offeror's good and extensive experience with an offeror that has good, yet brief experience, is not reasonable.

f. ManTech Telecommunications & Information Systems Corporation, B-285826, Academic.

The U.S. Army Intelligence Security Command (INSCOM) issued a solicitation for certain intelligence-related services. The solicitation announced INSCOM's intent to award a single time and materials (T&M) requirements contract. In response to the solicitation, INSCOM received two proposals. The solicitation required offerors to propose fully loaded labor rates. These would be applied to INSCOM labor estimates provided in the solicitation to evaluate price. ManTech complied with the solicitation. The awardee however, placed only about 80% of its expected labor costs in its labor rates. The remaining 20% was proposed as Other Direct Costs (ODCs). Under the solicitation, ODCs were not evaluated as part of the offeror's price. A best value analysis determined that ManTech's technically superior proposal was not worth its excessive price. In an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) "outcome prediction," GAO opined that the awardee's methodology evaded the solicitation's requirement to propose fully loaded labor rates, gave it an unfair advantage in the price evaluation, and should have been rejected as unacceptable by INSCOM.

Lesson Learn: When a fixed-price T&M solicitation requires offerors to propose fixed, fully loaded labor rates, the requirement for such rates is a material term of the contract. Proposals that fail to unequivocally comply in this regard cannot be accepted.

g. TLC Systems, B-2855687.2, Sustained.

This was a protest of a Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) purchase by the Iowa Army National Guard (IANG) for remote-controlled fire-alarm system. TLC argued that the IANG delivery order included items of equipment that were not on the successful vendor's FSS contract. This allegation was correct. The IANG proposed as corrective action that it would delete from the delivery order all items not included on a valid FSS contract. GSA found the corrective action to be deficient because it appeared that the IANG was splitting its requirement for a complete system thereby potentially avoiding required full and open competition.

Lesson Learn: Always ensure that when buying from a FSS vendor that the items included on any delivery order are traceable to the FSS contract. Also, in making a FSS buy, there is no need to issue a RFQ or otherwise entertain quotes from non-FSS sources.

GAO PROTESTS FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
AMC TOTAL	20	15	25
ACLAL	0	0	1
ANDA	0	0	0
ARDEC	0	0	1
ARL	0	0	0
ATCOM	0	0	0
AMCOM	7	6	4
AMCOM (AATD)	0	0	0
BELVOIR	0	1	0
BGAD	0	0	0
CACWOO	1	1	0
CCAD	0	0	0
CBD COM	0	0	0
CECOM	4	0	4
DESCOM-Letterkenny	0	0	0
DPG	0	0	0
IOC	1	1	6
LEAD	0	0	0
MCALESTER	0	0	0
MICOM	0	0	0
NATICK	0	0	0
PBA	0	0	0
RMA	0	0	0
RRAD	0	0	0
SBCCOM	0	0	1
SSCOM	0	0	0
TACOM	7	5	4
TECOM	0	0	4
TECOM-OPTEC	0	0	0
TECOM-Dugway	0	0	0
TECOM-Yuma Proving Grou	0	0	0
USMA	0	0	0
VHFS	0	0	0
WSMR	0	1	0
WVA	0	0	0
YPG	0	0	0

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
USACE TOTAL	23	14	21
U.S. Army Engineer District			
Alaska	0	2	0
Baltimore	5	2	0
Buffalo	0	0	0
Charleston	0	0	0
Chicago	0	0	0
Detroit	0	0	1
Europe	0	1	0
Fort Worth	0	0	0
Galveston	0	0	0
Headquarters	1	0	0
Humphreys Eng. Center	0	0	0
Huntington	0	0	0
Huntsville	0	0	0
Jacksonville	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0
Kansas City	1	1	1
Little Rock	0	1	0
Los Angeles	0	0	1
Louisville	4	2	0
Memphis	1	0	0
Mobile	3	0	6
Nashville	0	0	0
New England	0	1	0
New York	0	0	2
New Orleans	2	1	3
Norfolk	0	0	0
Omaha	0	0	0
Pacific Ocean Division	0	0	0
Philadelphia	0	0	1
Pittsburgh	0	0	1
Portland	0	0	0
Rock Island	0	0	0
Sacramento	1	2	1
Savannah	4	0	2
Seattle	0	1	0
St. Louis	0	0	0
St. Paul	0	0	0
Transatlantic	0	0	0
Transatlantic (Europe)	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	1
Vicksburg	1	0	0
Walla Walla	0	0	0
Waterways Exp. Station	0	0	0
Wilmington District	0	0	1

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
DA OTHER TOTAL	19	19	34
Defense Supply Service - Wash	0	0	2
HQ Military Traffic Mgmt Cmd	1	1	2
Mil District of Wash	2	1	0
MEDCOM	2	4	8
National Guard Bureau	3	4	2
Ofc Dep Cdr for Health Care	0	0	0
USA Contracting Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Force Command	2	8	8
USA Information Sys Cmd	2	0	0
USA Intel & Security Cmd	0	0	0
USA Medical Res. & Mat Cmd	0	0	0
USA Pacific	0	0	0
USA South	0	0	1
USASDC	0	0	0
USA Space & Missel Def Cmd	0	0	0
USA TRADOC	2	1	11
8th USA - Korea	4	0	0
USSOC	1	0	0
USACFSC	0	0	0
USAREUR	0	0	0

**QUARTERLY REPORT FOR AGENCY LEVEL PROTESTS
FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2000 (4Q00)**

1. Number of protests filed:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	28	19	34
o AMC	4	4	5
o USACE	17	14	25
o DA Other	7	1	4

Please refer to listing of protests by MACOM at end of this report.

2. Number of protests sustained/granted:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	0	0	1
o AMC	0	0	0
o USACE	0	0	1
o DA Other	0	0	0

3. Costs:

a. Costs and fees awarded to protester:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$4,616	\$0	\$0
o AMC	\$0	\$0	\$0
o USACE	\$0	\$0	\$0
o DA Other	\$4,616	\$0	\$0

b. Estimated preaward value of requirement or postaward contract cost/price:

(1) Preaward protests (estimated value of requirement):

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$88,859,984	\$61,295,099	\$96,791,961
o AMC	\$50,743,500	\$4,199,096	\$47,324,081
o USACE	\$25,695,976	\$12,096,003	\$38,182,395
o DA Other	\$12,420,508	\$45,000,000	\$11,285,485

(2) Postaward protests (contract cost/price):

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$204,262,727	\$24,755,314	\$18,382,853
o AMC	\$1,963,886	\$2,027,314	\$0
o USACE	\$29,446,373	\$22,728,000	\$16,687,844
o DA Other	\$172,852,468	\$0	\$1,695,009

c. Total government personnel costs resulting from protests:

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
TOTAL	\$58,431	\$37,397	\$42,767
o AMC	\$17,785	\$15,961	\$16,559
o USACE	\$33,450	\$21,436	\$20,393
o DA Other	\$7,196	\$0	\$5,815

4. Lesson learn, issues, and trends:

AMC: No significant information to report.

USACE Lessons Learned: No significant information to report.

Other DA Lessons Learned: No significant information to report.

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
AMC TOTAL	4	8	5
ACLAL	0	0	0
ANDA	0	0	0
ARDEC	0	0	0
ARL	0	0	1
ATCOM	0	0	0
AMCOM	0	2	1
AMCOM (AATD)	0	0	0
BGAD	0	0	0
CACWOO	0	0	0
CCAD	0	0	0
CBDCOM	0	0	0
CECOM	0	1	0
DESCOM-Letterkenny	0	0	0
DPG	0	0	0
IOC	1	1	0
LEAD	0	0	0
MCALESTER	0	0	0
MICOM	0	0	0
NATICK	0	0	0
PBA	0	0	0
RMA	0	2	0
RRAD	0	0	0
SBCCOM	0	0	0
SSCOM	0	0	0
PM SANG - Saudi	0	0	0
TACOM	3	0	1
TECOM	0	1	2
USMA	0	0	0
WSMR	0	0	0
WVA	0	1	0
YPG	0	0	0

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
USACE TOTAL	17	14	25
U.S. Army Engineer District			
Alaska	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	3	1
Buffalo	0	0	0
Charleston	0	1	0
Chicago	0	0	1
Detroit	0	0	1
Europe	0	0	1
Fort Worth	4	0	2
Galveston	0	0	0
Humphreys Eng. Center	0	0	0
Huntington	0	0	0
Huntsville	1	0	1
Jacksonville	0	1	0
Japan	0	0	0
Kansas City	0	0	0
Little Rock	0	1	0
Los Angeles	0	1	0
Louisville	4	0	1
Memphis	1	1	0
Mobile	0	0	2
Nashville	0	0	0
New England	0	0	0
New York	3	0	2
New Orleans	1	1	0
Norfolk	1	1	3
Omaha	0	0	0
Pacific Ocean Division	0	0	0
Philadelphia	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	0	0	0
Portland	0	0	0
Rock Island	0	0	0
Sacramento	0	3	3
Savannah	1	0	2
Seattle	0	0	1
St. Louis	0	0	1
St. Paul	0	0	2
Transatlantic	1	0	1
Transatlantic (Europe)	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	0
Vicksburg	0	1	0
Walla Walla	0	0	0
Waterways Exp. Station	0	0	0
Wilmington District	0	0	0

	4Q00	3Q00	4Q99
DA OTHER TOTAL	7	1	4
Defense Supply Service - Wash	0	1	1
HQ Military Traffic Mgmt Cmd	0	0	0
Mil District of Wash	0	0	0
MEDCOM	0	0	1
National Guard Bureau	0	0	0
Ofc Dep Cdr for Health Care	0	0	0
USA Contracting Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Force Command	0	0	2
USA Information Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Intel & Security Cmd	0	0	0
USA Medical Res. & Mat Cmd	0	0	0
USA Pacific	0	0	0
USA South	0	0	0
USASDC	0	0	0
USA Space & Missel Def Cmd	0	0	0
USA TRADOC	0	0	0
8th USA - Korea	7	0	0
USSOC	0	0	0
USACFSC	0	0	0